

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 01 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Plow	)	Art Unit: 3622
	)	
Serial No.: 09/922,201	)	Examiner: Lastra
	)	
Filed: August 2, 2001	)	STL9-2000-0037-US1
	)	
For: SYSTEM, METHOD, AND COMPUTER	)	July 1, 2005
PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR SELECTIVELY	)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
DISPLAYING INTERNET ADVERTISEMENTS	)	San Diego, CA 92101
	)	

**REPLY BRIEF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

This brief responds to the Examiner's Answer dated June 28, 2005.

There is nothing in the Answer to support the bankruptcy of the Section 101 rejection, so Appellant will not belabor the point further.


Regarding the substantive rejections, Appellant has pointed out various and sundry claim limitations that are not taught by Rakavy et al. The examiner now responds with an observation about something in the present specification, which evidently the examiner is reading rather broadly. However, what is being examined are the claims, complete with the limitations discussed in Appellant's brief, not the specification. Appellant is familiar with broad claim interpretation during prosecution, but not with the principle of rejecting claims based on broad specification readings during prosecution. The Answer thus appears to propose a new and unsound precedent for rejecting claims.

1176-S.RPL

**CASE NO.: STL9-2000-0037-US1**  
**Serial No.: 09/922,201**  
**July 1, 2005**  
**Page 2**

**PATENT**  
**Filed: August 2, 2001**

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**John L. Rogitz**  
**Registration No. 33,549**  
**Attorney of Record**  
**750 B Street, Suite 3120**  
**San Diego, CA 92101**  
**Telephone: (619) 338-8075**

JLR:jg

1176-S.RPL